

Craig Puljan

From: Melora Shelton [meloras@gretteassociates.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 17, 2007 3:56 PM
To: Craig Puljan; matthewb@gretteassociates.com
Cc: 'David Pierce'
Subject: FW: Ash Grove Quantities
Attachments: dp66.pdf

Craig -

I'm forwarding David's new calculations. You're below 600 CY (barely), so we can definitely go forward with the current application. If you look at the attached drawing you can see the proposed dredge areas - it sounds like going with the red footprint makes the most sense from a dredging perspective - it looks like it's roughly 70 by 50, and is 570 CY. (I'd get a final footprint area from David to reference in the application).

Because the numbers so close to 600 CY you should be prepared to either respond to questions about whether the BMPs are working, or pre-emptively initiate that discussion as part of the application for both the City and the Corps (I don't think it's relevant for WDFW). Matthew and I would recommend the latter. I think that this could be limited to a discussion including:

- 1) Plausible causes for the additional accumulation,
- 2) Ash Grove's plan to try to determine what happened (e.g., looking at the dredge material),
- 3) Stating that in addition to the BMPs cited in 2005 (including annual bathymetry monitoring and weekly checks/adjustments of the conveyor skirting), you will voluntarily implement a system like the one Eric described for adding a column in your barge log for assessing the bottom depth during off loading

I would expect to still get questions back from the City and the Corps, and likely requests for follow-up correspondence after dredging has been completed, but with luck this sort of approach will keep giving the regulators from "suggesting" their own monitoring ideas or implementing additional BMPs. However, you never know, especially with the City.

GOOD NEWS - I got a call from the City and the Shoreline Exemption has been processed and approved. I have to pick up in person at DPD and will do so on Friday. Unless there is some reason why we cannot get the drawings ready for submission in the next few weeks (plan sheets and JARPA), I intend to request an appointment for SEPA intake by the end of this week - please let me know if that will not work for some reason.

I believe that's it for the moment. Craig, if there is some reason why either one of these footprints is problematic please let us know ASAP. All, call or e-mail with any questions.

Thanks so much,
Melora

From: David Pierce [mailto:dpierce@pndsea.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 17, 2007 12:51 PM
To: Melora Shelton
Subject: Ash Grove Quantities

M,

Attached is the drawing we used to estimate quantities. I did the red area first to see what the quantities were - 570 CY. The yellow area would have been closer to what the 45'x 65' would have been. However very hard to actually only dredge that area. It would be more in the range of 520 CY.

USEPA SF



1279591

11/1/2007

AGC2C000889

Any questions, let me know.

David Pierce, P.E., S.E. | Senior Vice President
P|N|D Engineers Inc.
811 First Avenue, Suite 570 Seattle, WA 98104
p. 206.624.1387 | f. 206.624.1388 | c. 206.200.1673
dpierce@pndsea.com | www.pndengineers.com

11/1/2007

AGC2C000890